

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STAFF ANALYSIS

BILL #: HB 1243

Education Personnel

SPONSOR(S): Mahon

TIED BILLS:

IDEN./SIM. BILLS: SB 1148

REFERENCE	ACTION	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR
1) PreK-12 Committee		Beagle	Mizereck
2) Education Appropriations Committee			
3) Education Council			
4) _____			
5) _____			

SUMMARY ANALYSIS

Regional professional development academies (RPDA) are a component of Florida's statewide system of professional development and inservice training. RPDAs collaborate with local business partners to develop educator training programs, and in turn market those programs to area teachers, administrators, schools and school districts.

RPDAs are initially funded through public matching start-up funds and must be self-sufficient after one year of operation.

House bill 1243 enables RPDAs to receive additional public funding after year one of operation and specifies that an RPDA is not part of a school district or governmental unit that it serves.

The bill will have an indeterminate fiscal impact. See FISCAL ANALYSIS.

The bill takes effect upon becoming law.

FULL ANALYSIS

I. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

A. HOUSE PRINCIPLES ANALYSIS:

Provides Limited Government: The bill enables regional professional development academies to receive state funding after their first year of operation.

B. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

Present Situation:

Current Florida law provides for a coordinated system of professional development for teachers, managers, and administrators to enable the education community to meet state and local student achievement standards and state education goals.¹ Each school district must develop a professional development system and master plan for inservice activities. The DOE must develop model plans, including use of student achievement data to align professional development programs with identified student needs.² School district plans must be approved by the DOE.

Similarly, s. 1012.985, F.S., establishes a system of inservice training designed to upgrade the skills of teachers, managers, and administrative personnel. RPDAs are the delivery mechanism in this system. RPDAs collaborate with local business partners to develop training programs, and in turn market those programs to schools in the region.³ The Schultz Center for Teaching and Leadership is the only RPDA established to date.

Initial funding for RPDAs may be provided through start-up funds from the DOE or as otherwise provided in the General Appropriations Act. To be eligible for start-up funds, the RPDA must meet the following criteria:

- Demonstrate collaboration with local business, district school boards, and postsecondary education institutions which may award college credit for courses offered by RPDA programs;
- Demonstrate capacity to improve teaching skills, provide ongoing follow-up and coaching, and meet professional development needs relating to improving student achievement;
- Be operated under contract with its public partners and governed by an independent board;
- Match start-up funds with an equal or greater amount of funding from private sources during its first year of operation, unless the RPDA is operated by a regional educational consortia;
- Demonstrate the ability to be self-supporting within one-year after opening through fees for service, grants, or private funds; and
- Own or lease a facility for providing programs.

The RPDA must contract with participating school districts to provide professional development services and may also market services to other school districts, private schools, or individuals not under contract.

Effect of Proposed Changes:

Currently, a RPDA must be self-sufficient after its first year of operation. House bill 1243 enables RPDAs to receive funding from DOE or as otherwise provided in the General Appropriations Act after its first year of operation. Subsequent funding may be used for the purposes of developing or

¹ Section 1012.98, F.S.

² Id.

³ Section 1012.985, F.S.

expanding existing programs, assessing inservice training or professional development, or to create additional programs.

The bill stipulates that a RPDA is not a component of any school district or governmental unit to which it provides service. However, this will not inhibit the Auditor General's authority⁴ to review agreements between school districts and RPDAs, nor will it exempt RPDAs from public records⁵ laws.

C. SECTION DIRECTORY:

Section 1. Amends s. 1012.985, F.S.; providing that a RPDA may receive public funding subsequent to its first year of operation; providing that a RPDA is not part of a school district or governmental entity to which it provides services.

Section 2. Provides that the bill takes effect upon becoming law.

II. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

1. Revenues:

This bill does not appear to have a fiscal impact on state government revenues.

2. Expenditures:

The fiscal impact of the bill on state expenditures depends on the extent additional public funds are provided in the General Appropriations Act. The House proposed budget for fiscal year 2006-2007 (PCB FC 06-01) includes \$350,000 for the Schultz Center.

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues:

This bill does not appear to have a fiscal impact on local government revenues.

2. Expenditures:

This bill does not appear to have a fiscal impact on local government expenditures.

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

Increased public funding may allow RPDAs to expand programs and services, thus generating additional revenues for these public-private partnerships.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

Current law requires that RPDAs be self-sufficient after year one of operation. The bill enables RPDAs to receive additional public funding after year one of operation.

III. COMMENTS

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

1. Applicability of Municipality/County Mandates Provision:

⁴ Senate Bill Analysis on Senate Bill 1148.

⁵ Florida Department of Education, Legislative Bill Analysis on Senate Bill 1148.

The bill does not require a city or county to spend funds or to take any action requiring the expenditure of funds.

2. Other:

None.

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

None.

C. DRAFTING ISSUES OR OTHER COMMENTS:

None.

IV. AMENDMENTS/COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE & COMBINED BILL CHANGES